

PROJECT APPRAISAL REPORT (PAR) 47

PAGE 1

1. PROJECT NO. 512-11-110-094.2	2. PAR FOR PERIOD: July 1971 TO August 1972	3. COUNTRY BRAZIL	4. PAR SERIAL NO. 73-4
------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------	----------------------	---------------------------

5. PROJECT TITLE

AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION - UNIVERSITY OF RIO GRANDE DO SUL

6. PROJECT DURATION: Began FY <u>63</u> Ends FY <u>73</u>	7. DATE LATEST PROP December 1969	8. DATE LATEST FIP	9. DATE PRIOR PAR September 1971
-----------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------	-------------------------------------

10. U.S. FUNDING	a. Cumulative Obligation Thru Prior FY: \$ <u>3,551,000</u>	b. Current FY Estimated Budget: \$ <u>322,000</u>	c. Estimated Budget to completion After Current FY: \$
------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------

11. KEY ACTION AGENTS (Contractor, Participating Agency or Voluntary Agency)

a. NAME UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN	b. CONTRACT, PASA OR VOL. AG. NO. AID/LA -147
------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------

I. NEW ACTIONS PROPOSED AND REQUESTED AS A RESULT OF THIS EVALUATION

A. ACTION IX			B. LIST OF ACTIONS	C. PROPOSED ACTION COMPLETION DATE
USAID	AID W	HOST		
		X	Take steps to diminish, if not eliminate, problems in hiring staff which have jeopardized participant training program.	Continuing
		X	UFRGS should take steps to develop a complete and operative policy on post-graduate education. Coordination of post-graduate programs should be improved.	March 1973
		X	Recognition should be given to special staffing needs of post-graduate programs.	March 1973
		X	Administration of the UFRGS experimental farm should be improved.	March 1973
CONT	X		Chief of Party is to insure that documentation of turnover of project commodities is up to date.	June 1973

PROJECT MANAGER: TYPED NAME, SIGNED INITIALS AND DATE: H. Johnson, ARDO
 VISION DIRECTOR: TYPED NAME, SIGNED INITIALS AND DATE: W.A. Ellis, D/AID
 DATE OF REPORT: January 30, 1973

PAR Team : UFRGS - Veloso, Markus, Cabral, Calhau, Krause, Grossman, Filchtiner;
 Wisconsin - Engelbert; USAID - Cohen; MEC - Clos.

WD 1020 25 (10-70)	PROJECT NO.	PAR FOR PERIOD:	COUNTRY	PAR SERIAL NO.
PAGE 2 PAR		TO		

II. PERFORMANCE OF KEY INPUTS AND ACTION AGENTS

A. IDENTIFY ACTION AGENT (Name of the organization, firm, or individual)	B. PERFORMANCE AGAINST PLAN							C. IMPORTANCE FOR ACHIEVING PROJECT PURPOSE (X)					
	1. OBJECTIVE FACILITY		2. STAFF LEVEL			3. EQUIP. AVAILABLE		MEDIUM				5. HIGH	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	
University of Wisconsin					X								X

Comment on key factors determining rating

The role of the University of Wisconsin contract team has been critical in supporting the struggle for increasing staff members and building facilities of the agricultural faculties of the UFRGS. Without these increases (which are just now beginning to be authorized) progress at UFRGS would all but cease. Use of contract technicians (both long and short term) is well planned to suit project needs. Relationships between contractor and counterparts are good. The contractor has complied with the terms of the contract.

4. PARTICIPANT TRAINING	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5
		X										X

Comment on key factors determining rating

Participant training program was severely jeopardized by a lack of available participants due to UFRGS delay or non approval of new faculty positions. Prospects for improvement of this situation to a limited extent are good, at this time.

6. COMMODITIES	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5
					X					X		

Comment on key factors determining rating

While all commodities and publications purchased are utilized, extent of utilization is somewhat constrained by space limitations.

7. OTHER DONORS (Name of donor)	a. PERSONNEL											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5
					X							X
		X										X

Comment on key factors determining rating

The staffs of the faculties being assisted are dedicated and capable. They have worked hard at overcoming the obstacles of insufficient manpower and facilities that have been caused by a central university administration that did not include agriculture among its top priorities. The UFRGS administration was changed in March and the new individuals in charge appear to be ready to give more support to the agricultural program.

7. OTHER DONORS	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5

(See Next Page for Comments on Other Donors)

II. 7. Continued: Comment on key factors determining rating of Other Donors

III. KEY OUTPUT INDICATORS AND TARGETS

A. QUANTITATIVE INDICATORS FOR MAJOR OUTPUTS	Calendar year used	TARGETS (Percentage/Rate/Amount)					END OF PROJECT
		CUMU- LATIVE PRIOR FY	CURRENT 71 72		FY 73	FY ____	
			TO DATE	TO END			
31 Degree candidates by 1972	PLANNED	31		7	7		29
	ACTUAL PERFORM- ANCE	15	5				
	REPLANNED						29
	PLANNED						
	ACTUAL PERFORM- ANCE						
	REPLANNED						
70 Full time faculty staff positions	PLANNED	51	70	-	9		70
	ACTUAL PERFORM- ANCE	37	9				
	REPLANNED						55
B. QUALITATIVE INDICATORS FOR MAJOR OUTPUTS	COMMENT:						
1. Effective extension programs	Operação Tatu (soils testing program) is widely respected and greatly contributing to Rio Grande do Sul's agricultural program.						
2. Proficient and sound post graduate program.	Despite lack of financial and personnel support by University Administration, F.A.V. and IEPE have advanced steadily in graduate program quantity and quality.						
3. Experiment farm developed.	Farm exists, but its usefulness limited because of limited financial support.						

FD-1020-25 (10-70) PAGE 4 PAR	PROJECT NO.	PAR FOR PERIOD:	COUNTRY	PAR SERIAL NO.
----------------------------------	-------------	-----------------	---------	----------------

IV. PROJECT PURPOSE

A. 1. Statement of purpose as currently envisaged. 2. Same as in PROP? YES NO
UFRGS can independently develop to the qualitative and quantitative level necessary to fulfill its role in meeting the needs of Brazil for trained agricultural technologists (including agricultural social scientists), teachers of agriculture, relevant research and extension.

b. 1. Conditions which will exist when above purpose is achieved.	2. Evidence to date of progress toward these conditions.
1. UFRGS is playing a constantly increasing and influential role in meeting the growing needs of the State and Nation for highly trained agricultural technicians and qualified teachers for graduate and post-graduate instruction in agriculture.	1. UFRGS is center of excellence for region and is upgrading skills of staffs at three other agricultural schools.
2. UFRGS is independently capable of conducting relevant research that is responsive to the needs of the agricultural sector and is being disseminated in collaboration with extension agencies.	2. Increasing coordination in all aspects of extension as well as continued assistance in major soil improvement program. 3. Increasing coordination of post-graduate programs and research with other post-graduate centers and Government Agencies as UFRGS becomes increasingly aware of its responsibilities in national development.

V. PROGRAMMING GOAL

- A. Statement of Programming Goal
1. Increase Brazilian per annum agricultural production.
 2. Modernize agricultural production and marketing to meet domestic demand and expand exports.

Will the achievement of the project purpose make a significant contribution to the programming goal, given the magnitude of the national problem? Cite evidence.

Yes. Development of the agricultural school of UFRGS will provide the technicians to achieve the program goal and the research required.